1	SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
2	COUNTY OF KINGS - CRIMINAL TERM - PART 19
3	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
4	-against- INDICTMENT NO.
5	Mapp, Dunaway & Payton Decision
6	Defendant.
7	Supreme Court 320 Jay Street
8	Brooklyn, New York December 23,2008
9	
LO	BEFORE:
L1	HONORABLE DANIEL K. CHUN,
12	Justice
13	
14	APPEARANCES:
15	FOR THE PEOPLE:
16	CHARLES J. HYNES, ESQ. District Attorney, Kings County
17	BY: WAYNE ALLEYNE, ESQ. Assistant District Attorney
18	FOR THE DEFENDANT:
19	HAROLD BAKER, ESQ. 32 Court Street
20	Brooklyn, New York
21	
22	
23	
24	MARK THE DOD
25	NORA LEE, RPR OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER

1	COURT CLERK: From the calendar, number one,
2	Indictment
3	Counsellors, your appearances, please, for
4	the record.
5	MR. ALLEYNE: Wayne Alleyne, appearing on
6	behalf of the People. Good morning good afternoon,
7	your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Good morning.
9	MR. BAKER: Good morning, Judge. For
LO	Mr. Harold Baker, 32 Court Street,
11	Brooklyn, New York.
12	THE COURT: Good morning.
L3	MR. ALLEYNE: Your Honor, while we wait for
L4	the defendant to come out, I just have to apologize
15	for the delay. I was held up in Part 31. They needed
۱6	someone to cover me. Unfortunately, there was no one
۱7	to do that, so I apologize to the Court and defense
18	counsel.
19	THE COURT: I heard that, so I knew that you
20	were not just MIA somewhere else.
21	(Whereupon, the defendant was produced
22	before the Court.}
23	THE COURT: Is there anything else either
24	counsel wishes to say before the decision?
25	MR. ALLEYNE: Nothing from the People.

MR. BAKER: No. Your Honor's had an opportunity to review my supplemental reply affirmation, so I'll rely on the arguments made in my papers.

THE COURT: All right. Defendant may be seated.

Mapp, Dunaway, and Payton hearings were conducted before me. People called Officer Tillotson, and the defense called a witness,

The following constitutes my findings of fact and conclusions of law: Officer Tillotson testified that he has -- he's a police officer in Anti-Crime. He's been there for about a year. He's been working at the 77th Precinct for more than six years.

On November 6th of 2007, he was working as an Anti-Crime officer, along with other officers, Tauby and Corroza. And although they were in anti-crime, they were patrolling in uniform in an unmarked car. Around 9:10 in the evening, he was on Saint John's, at the vicinity of Saint John's and Nostrand. He stopped the car in front of 817 Saint John's, and he testified that he was the rear passenger. He testified -- Officer Tillotson testified that he got out in front of 817 Saint

John's. He also added that he knows the building.

It's a problematic building, according to his

testimony. That there had been several arrests made
in the building.

And on the cross, it was brought out that -it was testified previously that when he was asked in
the grand jury, that he testified in the grand jury
that he went to the building pursuant to a separate
investigation, and that was the way that, to quote
him, that they wanted him to answer. That he didn't
respond there pursuant to a 911, but that there's been
a lot of complaints by tenants or in the community
about that building.

He further testified on direct that he saw two people inside the first door, which he said was part glass, and he said there were two people talking in the vestibule, and one turned towards

Officer Tillotson. And upon seeing Officer Tillotson, threw a Ziploc containing a green leafy substance, and ran into the -- further into the building.

Officer Tillotson testified, identified the defendant as the person who threw the Ziploc and ran into the building. Officer Tillotson testified that when he saw this, he was either walking up the steps to the five to six steps leading to this vestibule, or

he was right outside the door, on the top landing. He described the vestibule as about four feet by four feet. And he testified that he pursued the defendant, as defendant turned and opened the second door. The officer picked up the Ziploc containing what he believed to be marijuana. And as he did that, defendant slammed the door, the second door, on the officer. He was able to open that second door after it slammed on him. And when he opened the door, he saw defendant and the other both running away from the officer further down the hallway.

Defendant went straight down the hallway. The other went up the stairs. The officer followed the defendant, running behind the defendant. And as the defendant entered into an apartment and tried to close the door in front of the officer, he pushed against the door and he was able to push the door open. He testified that the hallway he chased the defendant into was about 30 feet in length.

And after he pushed the door open, he ran after the defendant, and he -- the defendant was apprehended inside the apartment, straight down the hallway in a larger area. There was a struggle in attempting to place him in handcuffs. And after he was placed in handcuffs, there was another bag of

green leafy substance in his front pocket, and in his rear pants pocket, a .38 caliber loaded revolver loaded with such rounds was recovered from his rear pants pocket. He testified that there was no one else in the apartment in that location. That's 817 Saint John's.

On cross, it was brought out there was no warrant, and there was no consent to enter the building. He -- Mr. Baker also brought out that this was not a city housing project but a private apartment building. And that as Officer Tillotson went up the stairs, that defendant was holding this bag of marijuana in his right hand, but his left hand -- left side was visible to the officer, and he described this bag as being about one inch by one inch, small bag. And he said he was about three feet away when he saw the defendant holding the bag.

The Court specifically questioned whether -what exactly Officer Tillotson saw. He stated that he
saw the green substance inside this bag. He was able
to see it in his hand, and he recognized it as being
likely marijuana.

It was also brought up on cross that the second door, after it was slammed on Officer Tillotson, he was able to pull it open in a

second or two by a couple of tugs. He was able to forcibly pull it open, and he testified that he took out the flashlight as he ran down the hallway inside the building or inside the apartment, but apparently the flashlight was not taken out outside when he was walking up the stairs.

work right after November 7th of '07. There was damage to the door. The door was split, and he was called by someone named Frank to work on the door.

The following constitutes my conclusions of law: If an officer establishes probable cause to arrest someone, it is well established that he may chase that person based upon that probable cause, and defendant may not withdraw into a dwelling or his private apartment to stop that chain of events which began with probable cause to arrest. And it applies not only in serious severe cases, but it applies to minor cases as well.

In the People's reply papers, they cite that even an infraction, as drinking a beer on the street, would justify a chase by officers, and if the defendant in that type of situation chooses to run into his home, it may justify a pursuit into the person's home. Therefore, the entire probable cause

depends on the testimony of Officer Tillotson and the credibility of Officer Tillotson.

Given the fact that although it does apply to minor cases as well, since it was a possession of marijuana that started the whole chain of events, and there's somewhat of a question whether or not this vestibule is a public place. If it is a public place, this observation of marijuana would make it a "B" misdemeanor. If it is not a public place, rather, a private vestibule, for example, if police would be able to arrest someone for trespassing there, then it would not be a public place. Then it would not be a "B" misdemeanor, possession of marijuana, but it would be a violation, a possession of marijuana.

Nonetheless, People have to establish that
Officer Tillotson had probable cause to arrest based
upon his observation. Given the size of this
particular bag of marijuana, given the time of when it
occurred, and upon examining the pictures that are in
evidence, all those factors, I believe, warrants this
Court to very carefully and diligently scrutinize
Officer Tillotson's testimony. And in doing so, I
find that as a matter of law, that the Court simply
cannot credit all of Officer Tillotson's testimony,
especially the part considering his observation of the

bag in the defendant's hand and how he drops it and how he recovers it, leading to the chase. The pictures of the building indicate it's a very run-down building, with small areas of glass surrounded by either what appears to be wooden frames, and to say that through — while he's approaching that door, he could see a very small bag held by the defendant in which was green substance, in this Court's opinion, stretches credibility beyond what this Court is going to accept.

I do not credit his testimony on that portion, and I find that it's highly more likely that he may have thought that he saw something. Upon seeing the officers, defendant and someone he was with chose to run in the building, to which the officer gave chase. Therefore, this Court is of the opinion that the People did not establish that
Officer Tillotson had probable cause. It would have been nearly impossible to see such a small bag unless the defendant was holding it right open, in open door, towards the officer. It would have been almost impossible to see a bag of this size.

Therefore, I find that there is no probable cause to attempt to arrest the defendant, and therefore, there was a violation pursuant to Payton

when they chased after the defendant into his
apartment and recovered the other bag of marijuana and
the guns. And therefore this Court, in not finding
Officer Tillotson's testimony to be credible, grants
defendant's motion to suppress the gun and the
marijuana from the person. The marijuana recovered
from the ground is not suppressed.
I'm going to adjourn for People to decide
whether or not Poople choose to appeal the Court's

I'm going to adjourn for People to decide whether or not People choose to appeal the Court's decision or ruling. January 28th?

MR. ALLEYNE: That's a bad day for me, your Honor. I have a trial starting.

THE COURT: February 4th?

MR. BAKER: February 4th is good, Judge.

I have a bail application.

THE COURT: February 4th works for the People?

MR. ALLEYNE: Can I get something a little later, your Honor, because --

THE COURT: 2/11.

MR. ALLEYNE: 2/11, yes, that's fine.

THE COURT: Mr. Baker?

MR. BAKER: 2/11 is good, Judge.

THE COURT: What was your application?

MR. BAKER: Judge, I'd like to have my

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

client released in his own recognizance. Your Honor has rendered a decision. We're not sure if the People are going to appeal or not, but in any event, it substantially changes the circumstances. And as it stands right now, with the gun suppressed, the People are unable to make their case of criminal possession of a weapon. They're left with basically a violation, possession of marijuana. So at this point that's a substantial change in circumstances, which I would argue warrants a reduction in bail. I think his bail is presently \$10,000 cash bail. I would ask you to release my client. He does have ties to the community. He's got two brothers who have been in touch with me. They haven't been able to make it to court every day, but they are in contact with me. He's got a place to stay. He's going to stay with his brother.

What's your brother's name?

(Mr. Baker conferring with defendant.)

MR. BAKER: He's got another brother that lives in Brooklyn. And he assures me that he's going to come back to court every single time.

Since your Honor has -- the nature of your Honor's decision has to do with the credibility of the police officer, I don't really see on what grounds the

D.A.'s going to appeal, so I don't think they're going to appeal this decision. I think it's going to stand, and I think the defendant should be released.

THE COURT: All right. This is -- I've been ten years on the bench. I guess this is my second -- only the second case where I found the officer not credible, I suppose. And I'm going to set misdemeanor bail. I'm going to reduce bail to a thousand over a thousand.

February 11th, for decision by the People whether to appeal.

MR. BAKER: Judge, there is another issue.

I don't know what we can do about it, but I'm

concerned because my client's family can definitely

make that bail. But his paperwork says that there is

some kind of hold on him. They're not sure what it

is. There's been no detainer filed, and I'd like to

try to ascertain what the status of that is if we can

before we adjourn, because otherwise, he's going to be

able to make bail.

THE COURT: We're not going to be able to ascertain it here. It'll come up when he attempts to make bail, and then you can --

THE SERGEANT: Is he on parole?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

1	(Discussion held off the record.)
2	THE SERGEANT: Immigration? Okay, so it's
3	either parole or immigration.
4	THE COURT: All right, February 11th. Thank
5	you.
6	MR. BAKER: Thank you very much, your Honor.
7	MR. ALLEYNE: Thank you, your Honor.
8	THE SERGEANT: Back here, Judge?
9	THE COURT: Yes, back here.
LO	* *
11	It is hereby certified that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the
L2	stenographic notes of these proceedings.
L3	$\setminus \wedge \setminus \setminus$
L 4	NORA LEE, RPR
1.5	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER SUPREME COURT-KINGS COUNTY
16	
L7	
L8	
L9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK COUNTY OF KINGS: CRIMINAL TERM: PART 19

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

- against -

Dismissal

Defendant.

Indict. No.

320 Jay Street Brooklyn, New York January 21, 2009

BEFORE:

HONORABLE DANNY K. CHUN, Justice.

·----X

## APPEARANCES:

OFFICE OF CHARLES HYNES, ESQ.
DISTRICT ATTORNEY, KINGS COUNTY
Attorney for the People
BY: WAYNE ALLEYNE, ESQ.
Assistant District Attorney

HAROLD BAKER, ESQ.
Attorney for the Defendant,
32 Court Street,
Brooklyn, New York

ERIC S. POLLYEA, Official Court Reporter

	<b>}</b>
1	THE CLERK: From the calendar, number eight,
2	Indictment Number , the People versus
3	
4	Counselors, would you please state your
5	appearances for the record?
6	MR. BAKER: Harold Baker, 32 Court Street,
7	Brooklyn, New York.
8	MR. ALLEYNE: Wayne Alleyne, appearing on
9	behalf of the People.
10	THE COURT: This matter is advanced from the
11	initial date of February 11th at Mr. Baker's request.
12	MR. BAKER: Correct. The People have decided
13	not to appeal the Court's ruling in the suppression
14	hearing.
15	So I advanced the case for purposes of moving
16	to dismiss the indictment.
17	MR. ALLEYNE: That is true. People will not be
18	appealing.
19	And in the interests of justice, People move
20	to now dismiss the indictment.
21	THE COURT: People move to dismiss the
22	indictment.
23	I will excuse the defendant's appearance.
24	That application is granted. Indictment dismissed. And

sealed. Bail exonerated.

25

It is hereby certified that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the stenographic record.

Eric & Pollypa

ERIC S. POLLYEA, Official Court Reporter